

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP
Intellectual Property Law

Unofficial

550 West C Street
 Suite 1200
 San Diego CA 92101
 Tel 619-235-8550
 Fax 619-235-0176
www.kmob.com

RECEIVED
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 12 2004

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

CONFIRMATION COPY WILL FOLLOW VIA:

- MAIL
- INTERNATIONAL AIRMAIL
- COURIER
- E-MAIL

- WILL NOT FOLLOW**
- HAND DELIVERY
 - WITH ENCLOSURES
 - WITHOUT ENCLOSURES

Confidentiality Notice:

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information which may be legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named below. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us; and any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited.

TO: Examiner Baoquoc To
 FIRM: United States Patent and Trademark Office
 FACSIMILE NO.: (703) 746-7419
 OUR REF.: VIRAGE.033A
 YOUR REF.: 09/828,506
 FROM: John M. Carson
 OPERATOR: Kimberly E. Lengyel NO. OF PAGES: 4 (incl. cover sheet)
 DATE: March 11, 2004 TIME:

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES PLEASE CALL BACK IMMEDIATELY
 OPERATOR PHONE No.: (619) 235-8550 FACSIMILE No.: (619) 235-0176

MESSAGE:

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION – DO NOT ENTER

Attached is the agenda for our in-person interview tomorrow at 11:30 a.m.

Orange County
 800.760.7444

San Francisco
 415.954.4114

Los Angeles
 310.551.3450

Riverside
 909.781.9231

San Luis Obispo
 805.547.5580

Unofficial**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 12 2004****INFORMAL COMMUNICATION - Do Not Enter**

Attorney Docket No.: VIRAGE.033A
Application No.: 09/828,506
Filing Date: April 6, 2001
Examiner: Baoquoc N. To
Art Unit: 2172

Agenda for Personal Interview - March 12, 2004

Claims 15-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,446). Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. in view of Jain (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,853, assigned to Ericsson).

What Brown et al Discloses

The Brown et al. reference is directed to *hierarchical grouping and ranking of a set of objects in a query based on one or more relationships, where the relationships are topical relevancy and structural relevancy*. The Brown specification describes the objects as hypermedia objects that

are items such as books, articles, reports, pictures, movies, or recordings containing text, images, video, audio, or any other multimedia object and/or information

at column 6. The background of the Brown specification, at column 1, also describes that:

content-based search techniques for video and sound exist and have been incorporated into prototype systems, but this technology is less mature than text and image search. Objects found using an attribute-based or content-based search system are said to be 'topically relevant' to the query.

There is no further mention of "video" in the specification. Creating an index for a general hypermedia object database is described in columns 2 and 3 of the Brown specification. Therefore, it appears that any indexing is to the presence and identity of an object such as a video, but not to metadata identified clips of the video, for example. The text identified at column 3 of the Brown specification:

All of the objects are gathered by identifying a few key starting points, retrieving those objects for indexing, retrieving and indexing all objects referenced by the

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION - Do Not Enter
Application No.: 09/828,506

objects just indexed (via hyperlinks), and continuing recursively until all objects reachable from the starting points have been retrieved and indexed.

is silent as to indexing time-based aspects of a video.

Claims 15, 20

Video is unique in that it is time-based and contains many scenes or clips which may include different people, events, and so forth. Other types of media, e.g., books, articles, reports, pictures, and so forth, are not time-based. The ability of "generating a time-based index of the video", as claimed in Claim 15, or "generating time-based metadata through access to the video", as claimed in Claim 20, allows a user to subsequently query for a particular clip of the video, for example.

The citations provided in the Office Action do not describe a time-based index of the video and no motivation for generating and using a time-based index of the video is discussed. Note that time-based indexing is further described in the Applicant's U.S. Patent No. 6,360,234, which is incorporated by reference in the above-identified application.

Claim 16

There is no mention of identifying multiple versions of a video so that it is only indexed one time (Claim 16) in the Brown citation and no motivation for including this aspect is discussed in Brown.

Claim 17

There is no mention of parsing out blocks of script associated with the video and executing the parsed blocks of script so as to identify one or more location identifiers corresponding to video segments (Claim 17) in the Brown citation and no motivation for including this aspect is discussed in Brown.

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION - Do Not Enter
Application No.: 09/828,506

Claim 18

There is no mention of grouping differently coded versions of the video together (Claim 18) in the Brown citation and no motivation for including this aspect is discussed in Brown.

Claim 19

Claim 19 recites "searching for video content, wherein a corresponding location identifier of the video may be used to invoke a specific coded video player of a site containing the video". This claim is directed to querying the time-based index after it has been generated and invoking a video player, such as MPEG or QuickTime. There is no mention of this aspect in the Brown citation and no motivation for including this aspect is discussed in Brown.

Claim 21

Claim 21 includes "indexing the located video into a video index and performing maintenance operations on the located video". The Brown citation does not describe these aspects. Applicant's Claims 22-24 further describe several maintenance operations not described in the Brown citations.

Claim 25

Claim 25 includes "parsing a script associated with the identified video, and launching the identified video for playback on a visual display according to the parsed script". The citations in Brown and Jain provided in the Office Action do not describe these aspects of Claim 25. The text cited in the Jain reference describes that a web page is formatted via HTML, and typically displays text and graphics, and can play sound, animation, and video data. This does not describe "parsing a script associated with the identified video, and launching the identified video for playback on a visual display according to the parsed script", as claimed in Claim 25. Parsing of HTML is just the starting point for video spidering as described in Applicant's specification. The parsing and launching aspects of the claim are shown in Figure 4 (block 424), Figure 6 (block 422/424) and Figure 7, and are described at page 3, lines 19-30; page 4, line 22 to page 5 line 8; page 15 lines 24-29; and page 23, lines 18-29.

S:\DOCS\RJS\RJS-7317.DOC
031004